arXiv:hep-th/0403295v3 10 Jun 2004

`hep-th/0403295`
KAIST-TH 2004/01
March, 2004

Geometry mediated SUSY breaking

Yutaka Sakamura *

Department of Physics,
Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology
Daejeon 305-701, Korea

Abstract

We investigate SUSY breaking mediated through the deformation of the space-time geometry due to the backreaction of a nontrivial configuration of a bulk scalar field. To illustrate its features, we work with a toy model in which the bulk is four dimensions. Using the superconformal formulation of SUGRA, we provide a systematic method of deriving the 3D effective action expressed by the superfields, which can basically be extended to 5D SUGRA straightforwardly.

---

* *e-mail address:sakamura@muon.kaist.ac.kr*

1 Introduction

Supersymmetry (SUSY) is one of the most promising candidates for the extension of the standard model. When you construct a realistic SUSY model, some mechanism for SUSY breaking is indispensable because no superparticles have been observed yet. However, in four dimensions, somewhat complicated set-up is necessary to break SUSY [1].

On the other hand, the brane-world scenario [2, 3] has been attracted much attention and investigated in various frameworks. For example, some models can solve the gauge hierarchy problem [3], and some can provide various patterns of gauge symmetry breaking without the Higgs fields [4]. Especially, the introduction of extra dimensions can provide a new SUSY breaking mechanism [5, 6].

When we construct the brane-world models, the radii of the extra dimensions have to be stabilized. One of the popular stabilization mechanisms is proposed in Ref. [7], and similar mechanisms have also been studied [8]. These mechanisms involve a bulk scalar field that has a nontrivial field configuration. In such a case, the background geometry receives the backreaction of the scalar configuration. However, effects of such backreaction have been neglected in most works. In this paper, we will concentrate on such effects and investigate the SUSY breaking effects mediated through the deformation of the space-time geometry due to the backreaction.

Since we would like to focus on the effects of SUSY breaking through the geometry, we will consider a situation where some scalar field has a *non-BPS* configuration in the hidden sector, which decouples from our visible sector. Then, the dominant contribution to SUSY breaking in the visible sector comes from the geometry-mediated effects. In this paper, we will suppose that there is only one extra dimension compactified on S^1 or S^1/Z_2, for simplicity

In order to understand qualitative features of this type of scenario, we will work with a simplified toy model, in which the bulk space-time is four dimensions (4D) and the effective theory is three-dimensional (3D). Although the 4D SUSY theories are less restrictive than the 5D ones and there are some different points between them, both situations have many common features. So we believe that our work is quite instructive to understand the characteristic features of the *geometry mediated SUSY breaking*.

An interesting example of the stabilization mechanisms is proposed in Ref. [9]. In this article, the authors found a non-BPS solution in the 4D supergravity (SUGRA), which stabilizes the radius of the extra dimension and simultaneously generates a warped geometry.

In the following, we will assume the existence of the non-BPS solution in 4D SUGRA, and derive the 3D effective theory on that background. Because the superfield formalism is very useful to discuss the phenomenology of the effective theory, we would like to express the 3D effective action in terms of 3D superfields and the SUSY breaking terms. The main obstacle to our purpose is how we should define SUSY on the non-BPS background space-time. To solve this difficulty, the superconformal formulation of 4D SUGRA [10] is useful. Our strategy is as follows. We will see that 3D *global* SUSY can be defined on the gravitational background *before* the gauge fixing of the superconformal symmetry, even in the case that the background is non-BPS. So we can write an invariant action under the superconformal transformations in terms of 3D superfields constructed by that global SUSY. After the gauge fixing, the global SUSY will be broken and the SUSY breaking terms will emerge. In other words, *SUSY is broken by the gauge fixing conditions* in our method.

The paper is organized as follows. In the next section, we will briefly review the superconformal approach of 4D SUGRA that is useful for our discussion. Then, we will rewrite the invariant action in terms of 3D superfields. In Sect. 3, we will impose the gauge fixing conditions and derive the 3D effective action with the SUSY breaking terms. Sect. 4 is devoted to the summary and some discussions. Notations we use in this paper are listed in Appendix A, and a brief comment on the radion superfield is provided in Appendix B.

2 Action formula

2.1 Superconformal approach of 4D SUGRA

We will consider a 4D $\mathcal{N}=1$ supergravity model as a bulk theory. For our purpose, the superconformal approach [10] is useful. The field contents are as follows.

Superconformal gauge fields:

$$h_\mu = -e_\mu{}^a P_a + \frac{1}{2}\omega_\mu{}^{ab}M_{ab} + \frac{\kappa}{2}\left(\psi_\mu Q + \bar{\psi}_\mu \bar{Q}\right) + b_\mu D + A_\mu A + \varphi_\mu S + \bar{\varphi}_\mu \bar{S} + f_\mu{}^a K_a, \quad (1)$$

where $P_a, M_{ab}, Q_\alpha, \cdots$ are the generators of the 4D $\mathcal{N}=1$ superconformal algebra[1], whose commutation relations are listed in Appendix A.1. A constant κ will be identified with the gravitational coupling after the gauge fixing (9), but it is just a constant at this stage. Throughout this paper, we will use $a, b, c, \cdots$ for the local Lorentz indices, and $\mu, \nu, \rho, \cdots$ for the world vector indices.

Other fields form the superconformal multiplets, which are characterized by the Weyl weight w and the chiral weight n.[2]

Chiral multiplets ($w = \frac{3}{2}n$)**:**

$$\Phi^I = [\phi^I, \chi^I_\alpha, \mathcal{F}^I], \qquad (I = 0, 1, 2, \cdots) \quad (2)$$

where $\Sigma \equiv \Phi^{I=0}$ is the compensator multiplet whose Weyl weight is one, while $\Phi^{I\neq 0}$ have zero Weyl weights. We will assume that $\Phi^{I=1}$ is a field in the hidden sector, and its scalar component $\phi^{\rm h} \equiv \phi^{I=1}$ has a nontrivial background configuration $\phi^{\rm h}_{\rm bg}$. The two multiplets $\Phi^{I=0,1}$ are neutral under the gauge group mentioned below. We will refer to the rest chiral multiplets $\Phi^i \equiv \Phi^I$ ($i = I = 2, 3, \cdots$) as the matter multiplets, and they may be charged under the gauge group.

---

[1] The minus sign of the first term is necessary to match our notations to those of Ref.[11].

[2] The definition of n is different from that of Ref. [10, 12] by a factor of $\frac{3}{2}$.

(Internal) Gauge multiplet:

The gauge multiplet $[B^g_\mu, \lambda^g_\alpha, D^g]$ can be embedded into a real general multiplet V^g with $w = n = 0$ as

$$V^g = [C^g, \zeta^g_\alpha, \mathcal{H}^g, e_a{}^\mu B^g_\mu - \frac{\kappa}{2}(\psi_a \zeta^g + \bar{\psi}_a \bar{\zeta}^g), \lambda^g_\alpha, D^g], \tag{3}$$

where $e_a{}^\mu$ is an inverse matrix of the vierbein $e_\mu{}^a$. Using the gauge degrees of freedom, we can set C^g, ζ^g_α and $\mathcal{H}^g$ to zero[3]. For simplicity, we will assume that the gauge group is abelian. In order for this gauge symmetry to remain in the 3D effective theory, it must be represented by a real representation because the 3D supermultiplets are real. Thus, we will concentrate on the case that the charged matter fields are doublets for the $SO(2)$ gauge group, and the gauge multiplet is represented as 2×2 matrices on them. From the above gauge multiplet, we can construct the superfield strength multiplet $\mathcal{W}^g_\alpha$, which is a chiral multiplet with an external spinor index α, as

$$\mathcal{W}^g_\alpha = \left[-i\lambda^g_\alpha, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left\{ \delta_\alpha{}^\beta D^g - i \left(\sigma^{ab}\right)_\alpha{}^\beta \hat{F}^g_{ab} \right\}, \left(\sigma^a \mathcal{D}_a \bar{\lambda}^g\right)_\alpha \right], \tag{4}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{F}^g_{\mu\nu} &\equiv \partial_\mu B^g_\nu - i\left(\psi_\mu \sigma_\nu \bar{\lambda}^g + \bar{\psi}_\mu \bar{\sigma}_\nu \lambda^g\right) - (\mu \leftrightarrow \nu), \\ \mathcal{D}_\mu \lambda^g_\alpha &= \partial_\mu \lambda^g_\alpha + \frac{1}{2}\omega_\mu{}^{ab}\left(\sigma_{ab}\lambda^g\right)_\alpha - i\psi_{\mu\alpha} D^g - \left(\sigma^{ab}\psi_\mu\right)_\alpha \hat{F}^g_{ab} - \frac{3}{2} b_\mu \lambda^g_\alpha + iA_\mu \lambda^g_\alpha. \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

The multiplication laws of the above multiplets can be read off from Ref. [12]. Some of them are listed in Appendix A.1.

In order to identify P_a with the generator of the general coordinate transformation, some constraints are imposed on the field strengths of the gauge fields in Eq.(1). Then, $\omega_\mu{}^{ab}$, φ_μ and $f_\mu{}^a$ becomes dependent fields, *i.e.*, they can be expressed in terms of $e_\mu{}^a$, ψ^α_μ, A_μ and b_μ. This corresponds to a deformation of the original superconformal algebra.

We can construct an invariant action under the deformed superconformal transformation by using the action formulae, which are listed in Appendix A.1.

$$S = \int d^4x \left[G(\bar{\Phi}, \Phi) + \Gamma(\bar{\Phi}, \Phi, V^g) \right]_D + \int d^4x \left[W(\Phi) \right]_F + \int d^4x \left[\frac{1}{4} \mathrm{tr}\left(\mathcal{W}^{g\alpha} \mathcal{W}^g_\alpha \right) \right]_F, \tag{6}$$

where Γ is a function determined so that $G + \Gamma$ is $SO(2)$-gauge invariant[4], and

$$\begin{aligned} G(\bar{\Phi}, \Phi) &\equiv -\bar{\Sigma}\Sigma \exp\left\{ -\frac{\kappa^2}{3} \sum_{I \neq 0} \bar{\Phi}^{\bar{I}} \Phi^I \right\}, \\ W(\Phi) &\equiv \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^{3/2} \kappa^3 \Sigma^3 P(\Phi). \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

---

[3] This corresponds to the Wess-Zumino gauge in the global SUSY gauge theory.

[4] Determination of Γ is explained in Ref. [11].

Here, we have assumed that the Kähler potential is minimal, and the superpotential $P(\Phi)$ has a form:

$$P(\Phi) = P_{\text{hid}}(\Phi^{\text{h}}) + P_{\text{vis}}(\Phi^{i}). \tag{8}$$

This corresponds to the assumption that the visible sector is decoupled from the hidden sector. In Eq.(6), the physical fields Φ^I ($I \neq 0$) and the gravitino ψ_μ will be canonically normalized ones after the following gauge fixing.

Finally, we can obtain the Poincaré SUGRA action by fixing the gauge of the superconformal symmetry,

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi^\Sigma &= \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}\kappa^{-1}\exp\left\{\frac{\kappa^2}{6}\sum_{I\neq 0}\bar{\phi}^{\bar{I}}\phi^I\right\}, && (D,\ A\text{-gauge fixing}) \\
\chi_\alpha^\Sigma &= \frac{\kappa^2}{3}\phi^\Sigma\sum_{I\neq 0}\bar{\phi}^{\bar{I}}\chi_\alpha^I, && (S\text{-gauge fixing}) \\
b_\mu &= 0. && (K\text{-gauge fixing}) \qquad (9)
\end{aligned}$$

By this gauge fixing, κ is identified with the gravitational coupling, *i.e.*, the inverse of the 4D Planck mass M_{pl}. The derivation of these gauge fixing conditions is briefly commented in Appendix A.1. After integrating out the auxiliary fields, we can check that the resulting action is identical to the one in Ref. [11].

2.2 Action on the gravitational background

Throughout the paper, we will choose the x_2-direction as the extra dimension. So, $m, n = 0, 1, 3$ denote the 3D vector indices and $y \equiv x_2$ is the coordinate of the extra dimension compactified on S^1 (or S^1/Z_2). We will use the letters with underbar for the local Lorentz indices, and those without the underbar for the world vector indices.

The background metric is assumed to be of the form:

$$ds^2 = g_{\mu\nu}dx^\mu dx^\nu = e^{2A(y)}\eta_{\underline{mn}}dx^m dx^n + dy^2. \tag{10}$$

Since we are not interested in the gravitational interactions in the 3D effective theory, we will freeze the gravitational multiplet to its background value in the following discussion.

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle e_\mu^{\ \underline{a}}\rangle &= \text{diag}\left(e^A, e^A, 1, e^A\right), \\
\langle \psi_\mu^\alpha\rangle &= 0, \\
\langle A_m\rangle &= 0, \\
\langle A_y\rangle &= \frac{\kappa^2}{2}\text{Im}\left(\bar{\phi}_{\text{bg}}^{\text{h}}\dot{\phi}_{\text{bg}}^{\text{h}}\right),
\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

where the dot denotes the derivative with respective to y. In the last equation, we have used the equation of motion for A_y. Note that A_μ, the gauge field of $U(1)_A$, is an auxiliary field since it does not have a kinetic term. Furthermore, we will drop the dependence on b_μ, the gauge field of the dilatation D, in the following calculation because it will eventually be set to zero by the gauge fixing condition in Eq.(9).

Then, the action (6) becomes

$$S_{\text{bg}} = \int d^4x\, e \left[\frac{C}{3} R + D + \left\{ \mathcal{F} + \frac{1}{4} \text{tr} \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{W}} + \text{h.c.} \right\} \right]. \tag{12}$$

Here, $e \equiv \det({e_\mu}^a)$ and the Ricci scalar R are their background values.

$$\begin{aligned} e &= e^{3A}, \\ R &= 6(\ddot{A} + 2\dot{A}^2). \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

From the multiplication laws of the superconformal multiplets, we can compute each components as

$$\begin{aligned} C &= G(\bar{\phi}, \phi), \\ D &= G_{I\bar{J}} \left\{ -2\mathcal{D}^\mu \bar{\phi}^{\bar{J}} \mathcal{D}_\mu \phi^I - i\chi^I \sigma^a \mathcal{D}_a \bar{\chi}^{\bar{J}} - i\bar{\chi}^{\bar{J}} \bar{\sigma}^a \mathcal{D}_a \chi^I + 2\bar{\mathcal{F}}^{\bar{J}} \mathcal{F}^I \right\} \\ &\quad + G_{IJ\bar{K}} \left\{ i\chi^J \sigma^a \bar{\chi}^{\bar{K}} \mathcal{D}_a \phi^I - \bar{\mathcal{F}}^{\bar{K}} \left(\chi^I \chi^J \right) \right\} \\ &\quad + G_{I\bar{J}\bar{K}} \left\{ i\bar{\chi}^{\bar{K}} \bar{\sigma}^a \chi^I \mathcal{D}_a \bar{\phi}^{\bar{J}} - \mathcal{F}^I \left(\bar{\chi}^{\bar{J}} \bar{\chi}^{\bar{K}} \right) \right\} + \frac{1}{2} G_{IJ\bar{K}\bar{L}} \left(\chi^I \chi^J \right) \left(\bar{\chi}^{\bar{K}} \bar{\chi}^{\bar{L}} \right) \\ &\quad + 2\sqrt{2} i \left\{ D_I^{SO(2)} \lambda^g \chi^I - D_{\bar{I}}^{SO(2)} \bar{\lambda}^g \bar{\chi}^{\bar{I}} \right\} + 2D^{SO(2)} D^g, \\ \mathcal{F} &= W_I \mathcal{F}^I - \frac{1}{2} W_{IJ} \chi^I \chi^J, \\ \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{W}} &= (D^g)^2 - \frac{1}{2} F^{g\mu\nu} F^g_{\mu\nu} - \frac{i}{4} \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} F^g_{\mu\nu} F^g_{\rho\sigma} - 2i\lambda^g \sigma^a \mathcal{D}_a \bar{\lambda}^g, \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

where $G(\bar{\phi}, \phi)$ and $W(\phi)$ are functions defined in Eq.(7), $F^g_{\mu\nu} \equiv \partial_\mu B^g_\nu - \partial_\nu B^g_\mu$ is the ordinary field strength, and $D^{SO(2)}$ is the Killing potential for the $SO(2)$ isometry of the Kähler manifold determined by $G(\bar{\phi}, \phi)$ [11]. The subscripts $I, J, \cdots$ denote the derivatives with respective to the corresponding scalar fields. The covariant derivatives are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_\mu \phi^I &\equiv \partial_\mu \phi^I + igB^g_\mu \phi^I \\ \mathcal{D}_\mu \chi^I_\alpha &\equiv \partial_\mu \chi^I_\alpha + igB^g_\mu \chi^I_\alpha + \frac{1}{2} {\omega_\mu}^{ab} \left(\sigma_{ab} \chi^I \right)_\alpha, \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

where g represents the corresponding charge for the $SO(2)$ gauge group, and ${\omega_\mu}^{ab}$ is the spin connection. Here, we have taken the Wess-Zumino gauge.

2.3 Global SUSY transformation and superfields

We will rewrite the action (12) on the 3D $\mathcal{N} = 1$ superspace (x^m, y, θ^α), where θ is a Grassmannian coordinate that is a 3D Majorana spinor.

2.3.1 The case of $\langle A_y \rangle = 0$

First, we will consider the case of $\langle A_y \rangle = 0$. Let us consider a superconformal transformation δ that preserves the gravitational background (11). Namely,

$$\delta = \delta_Q(\epsilon) + \delta_D(\lambda_D) + \delta_A(\vartheta_A) + \delta_S(\eta) + \delta_K(\xi_K). \tag{16}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_\alpha &= \frac{ie^{i\vartheta_0}}{\sqrt{2}} e^{\frac{A}{2}} \epsilon_{0\alpha}, \\ \eta_\alpha &= \frac{1}{2} \dot{A} \left(\sigma^2 \bar{\epsilon} \right)_\alpha, \\ \lambda_D &= \vartheta_A = \xi_{K\mu} = 0, \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

where ϵ_0 is a constant 3D Majorana spinor ($(\epsilon_0^\alpha)^* = \epsilon_0^\alpha$), and ϑ_0 is a constant phase. The transformation law of the gravitational multiplet is listed in Appendix A.1.

We can easily see that $\delta(\epsilon_0)$ satisfies the 3D $\mathcal{N} = 1$ SUSY algebra. So we can identify $\delta(\epsilon_0)$ with *global* 3D SUSY transformation. Since $\delta(\epsilon_0)$ preserves the gravitational background, the action $S_{\rm bg}$ in Eq.(12) is invariant under it. This ensures that $S_{\rm bg}$ can be rewritten in terms of the superfields constructed by $\delta(\epsilon_0)$.

We can construct superfields as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi^I &\equiv e^{\delta(\theta)} \phi^I, \\ \rho_\alpha &\equiv e^{\delta(\theta)} \zeta^g_{1\alpha}, \\ \sigma &\equiv e^{\delta(\theta)} \frac{1}{2} (-B^g_y + M^g), \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

where 3D Majorana spinor ζ_1^g and the real scalar M^g are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta^{g\alpha} &\equiv \frac{e^{-i\vartheta_0}}{\sqrt{2}} \left(\zeta_1^{g\alpha} + i\zeta_2^{g\alpha} \right), \\ \mathcal{H}^g &\equiv \frac{e^{-2i\vartheta_0}}{2} \left(M^g + iN^g \right). \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

It is easy to check that a global transformation induced by the differential operator:

$$\hat{Q}_\alpha = \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^\alpha} + i \left(\gamma^m_{(3)} \theta \right)_\alpha \partial_m \tag{20}$$

is identical to the above defined global SUSY transformation $\delta(\epsilon_0)$.

We can also construct a superfield $e^{\delta(\theta)} C^g$, but this is completely eliminated after taking the Wess-Zumino gauge and the further 4D gauge transformation [13]. In this gauge, we can obtain the following expressions.

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi^I(x,\theta) &\equiv \phi^I + e^{i\vartheta_0} e^{\frac{A}{2}} \theta \chi^I + \frac{e^A}{2} \theta^2 f^I, \\ \rho_\alpha(x,\theta) &\equiv -ie^{\frac{A}{2}} \left(\gamma^m_{(3)} \theta \right)_\alpha B^g_m - e^A \theta^2 \lambda^g_{2\alpha}, \\ \sigma(x,\theta) &\equiv -B^g_y + e^{\frac{A}{2}} \theta \lambda^g_1 - \frac{1}{2} e^A \theta^2 D^g, \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

where $\gamma^m_{(3)} \equiv e_{\underline{n}}{}^m \gamma^{\underline{n}}_{(3)}$,

$$f^I \equiv i\left(\partial_y \phi^I + igB^g_y \phi^I + e^{2i\vartheta_0}\mathcal{F}^I + w\dot{A}\phi^I\right), \qquad (w\text{: Weyl weight}) \tag{22}$$

and 3D Majorana spinors λ^g_1 and λ^g_2 are defined as

$$\lambda^{g\alpha} \equiv \frac{e^{i\vartheta_0}}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\lambda^{g\alpha}_1 + i\lambda^{g\alpha}_2\right). \tag{23}$$

Here and hereafter, we will use the 3D notations for spinors, which are listed in Appendix A.2. The superfield φ^I, which is constructed from the chiral multiplet, is a 3D scalar superfield, and ρ and σ are the 3D gauge superfield and the gauge scalar superfield, respectively. After fixing the background as Eq.(11), the action still has the 3D supergauge symmetry. Under its transformation $\delta^{\rm sg}$, the above superfields are transformed as

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta^{\rm sg}\varphi^I &= ig\Omega\varphi^I, \\
\delta^{\rm sg}\rho_\alpha &= -e^{-\frac{A}{2}} D_{\theta\alpha}\Omega, \\
\delta^{\rm sg}\sigma &= \partial_y \Omega,
\end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

where

$$D_{\theta\alpha} \equiv \frac{\partial}{\partial\theta^\alpha} - i\left(\gamma^m_{(3)}\theta\right)_\alpha \partial_m, \tag{25}$$

and the transformation parameter Ω is a 3D real scalar superfield. From these transformation properties, we can construct the following supergauge covariant derivatives.

$$\begin{aligned}
D_\alpha &\equiv D_{\theta\alpha} + ige^{\frac{A}{2}}\rho_\alpha, \\
\nabla_y &\equiv \partial_y - ig\sigma.
\end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

The gauge invariant quantities under Eq.(24) are

$$\begin{aligned}
w^g_\alpha &\equiv \frac{1}{4}e^{-A}D^2_\theta \rho_\alpha + \frac{i}{2}\left(\gamma^m_{(3)}\partial_m \rho\right)_\alpha \\
&= \lambda^g_{2\alpha} + e^{\frac{A}{2}}\left(\gamma^{mn}_{(3)}\theta\right)_\alpha F^g_{mn} - \frac{i}{2}e^A\theta^2\left(\gamma^m_{(3)}\partial_m \lambda^g_2\right)_\alpha, \\
u^g_\alpha &\equiv e^{-\frac{A}{2}}D_{\theta\alpha}\sigma + \left(\partial_y + \frac{\dot{A}}{2}\right)\rho_\alpha \\
&= \lambda^g_{1\alpha} - e^{\frac{A}{2}}\theta_\alpha D^g + ie^{\frac{A}{2}}\left(\gamma^m_{(3)}\theta\right)_\alpha\left(\partial_m B^g_y - \partial_y B^g_m\right) \\
&\quad + e^A\theta^2\left\{\frac{i}{2}\left(\gamma^m_{(3)}\partial_m\lambda^g_1\right)_\alpha - \left(\partial_y + \frac{3}{2}\dot{A}\right)\lambda^g_{2\alpha}\right\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

Here, w^g is the 3D superfield strength.

Using these superfields, we can rewrite the action (12) as

$$S_{\rm bg} = \int d^4x \int d^2\theta \Big[2e^A G_{I\bar{J}} D^\alpha \bar{\varphi}^{\bar{J}} D_\alpha \varphi^I + 4e^{2A} {\rm Im} \left\{ G_I \nabla_y \varphi^I + e^{-2i\vartheta_0} W(\varphi) \right\} \\ + \frac{e^{2A}}{2} {\rm tr} \left\{ (u^g)^2 - (w^g)^2 \right\} \Big]. \tag{28}$$

This corresponds to an extended version of the formula in Ref. [13] to the warped geometry. We can explicitly check that the above expression reproduces Eq.(12) with Eqs.(13), (14) up to total derivative terms by performing the θ-integration.

It should be noted that the above action is the expression *before* the superconformal gauge fixing (9). Thus, it is not yet the SUGRA action at this stage.

2.3.2 The case of $\langle A_y \rangle \neq 0$

Now, we will extend Eq.(28) to the case that $\langle A_y \rangle \neq 0$. Notice that we can move to the gauge where $\langle A_y \rangle = 0$ by using the $U(1)_A$-transformation, while keeping the other backgrounds unchanged. In this gauge, each field is rotated by its chiral weight with the parameter:

$$\vartheta_A(y) = -\int^y dz \, \langle A_y \rangle(z). \tag{29}$$

An integration constant can be absorbed into the constant phase ϑ_0. If we reconstruct 3D superfields by using the rotated bulk fields, the expression of $S_{\rm bg}$ becomes the same form as Eq.(28). Thus, we can obtain the desired $\langle A_y \rangle$-dependent action by re-expressing each component field in Eq.(28) in terms of the original ones, namely, by replacing each fields in Eq.(28) with the rotated ones with the parameter ϑ_A.

The rotated scalar superfield is

$$\varphi^I = e^{-\frac{2w}{3} i\vartheta_A} \left\{ \phi^I + e^{i\vartheta_A} e^{\frac{A}{2}} \theta \chi^I + \frac{i}{2} e^A \theta^2 \left(\partial_y \phi^I + igB^g_y \phi^I + \frac{2w}{3} i \langle A_y \rangle \phi^I + e^{2i\vartheta_A} \mathcal{F}^I + w\dot{A}\phi^I \right) \right\}. \tag{30}$$

Here, note that the chiral weight of the chiral multiplet is equal to $\frac{2w}{3}$.

Unlike the chiral multiplet[5], the 4D gauge multiplet must be decomposed into two different types of the 3D real multiplets to form the 3D superfields. So, the $U(1)_A$-rotation of the 4D complex field corresponds to the mixing between two 3D real fields. For example, λ^g_1 and λ^g_2 are mixed under the $U(1)_A$-rotation. This mixing breaks the global SUSY because they belong to different supermultiplets. In fact, since the mixing angle ϑ_A is y-dependent, the gaugino mass term appears from the y-derivative in the definition of u^g in Eq.(27). This is very similar to the Scherk-Schwarz (SS) SUSY breaking in the flat space-time [5]. However, SUSY breaking due to the non-zero $\langle A_y \rangle$ are different from the SS breaking in the following points. First, $U(1)_A$ is not a symmetry of the theory after the gauge fixing (9). So it is independent of $U(1)_R$ symmetry that is relevant to the SS breaking. Second, $\langle A_y \rangle$ is not an input parameter as in the SS mechanism, but is determined by the hidden sector dynamics, which also induces another types of SUSY breaking terms through the deformation of the warp factor as will be seen in Sect. 3.2.

---

[5] The chiral multiplet is also decomposed into two real multiplets, but these are the same type of the multiplet, *i.e.*, the scalar multiplet. So we can treat them as one complex scalar multiplet.

As a result, Eq.(28) is modified as

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\mathrm{bg}} = \int d^4x \int d^2\theta \, \Big[& 2e^{A} G_{I\bar{J}} D^{\alpha}\bar{\varphi}^{\bar{J}} D_{\alpha}\varphi^I + 4e^{2A}\mathrm{Im}\left\{ G_I \nabla_y \varphi^I + e^{-2i\theta_A} W(\varphi) \right\} \\ & + \frac{8}{3} e^{2A} \langle A_y \rangle G + \frac{e^{2A}}{2} \mathrm{tr}\left\{ T^{-1} \left(u^g\right)^2 - T \left(w^g\right)^2 \right\} \Big], \end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

where φ^I is redefined as

$$\varphi^I \equiv \phi^I + e^{i\vartheta_A} e^{\frac{A}{2}} \theta \chi^I + \frac{i}{2} e^{A} \theta^2 \left(\partial_y \phi^I + igB_y^g \phi^I + \frac{2w}{3} i \langle A_y \rangle \phi^I + e^{2i\vartheta_A} \mathcal{F}^I + w\dot{A}\phi^I \right), \tag{32}$$

and

$$T \equiv 1 + e^{A}\theta^2 \langle A_y \rangle \tag{33}$$

is a spurion superfield, which can be interpreted as a background value of the radion superfield mentioned in Appendix B.

Eq.(31) has a similar form to the expression in Ref. [14], but note that the latter is a result *after* the superconformal gauge fixing.

3 Gauge fixing and SUSY breaking

3.1 Deviation from SUSY limit

To discuss SUSY breaking, we should consider the supersymmetric limit first. When the background is a BPS configuration, a half of the bulk SUSY is conserved. In this case, the direction of the conserved SUSY is parametrized by the Killing spinor $\epsilon^{\alpha}(y)$, which is determined by the background configuration. Here, we will parametrize the Killing spinor as

$$\epsilon^{\alpha} = i e^{i\vartheta} \left| \epsilon^{\alpha} \right|. \tag{34}$$

The BPS equations are obtained as follows by requiring the local SUSY transformation[6] of the fermionic fields to vanish [9].

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{A} &= -\kappa^2 e^{-2i\vartheta} e^{\frac{\kappa^2}{2}\left|\phi^{\mathrm{h}}\right|^2} P_{\mathrm{hid}}, \\ \dot{\phi}^{\mathrm{h}} &= e^{2i\vartheta} e^{\frac{\kappa^2}{2}\left|\phi^{\mathrm{h}}\right|^2} \left(\frac{\partial \bar{P}_{\mathrm{hid}}}{\partial \bar{\phi}^{\mathrm{h}}} + \kappa^2 \phi^{\mathrm{h}}_{\mathrm{bg}} \bar{P}_{\mathrm{hid}} \right) \\ \dot{\left|\epsilon^{\alpha}\right|} &= \frac{\dot{A}}{2} \left|\epsilon^{\alpha}\right|, \\ \dot{\vartheta} &= -\frac{\kappa^2}{2} \mathrm{Im}\left(\bar{\phi}^{\mathrm{h}} \dot{\phi}^{\mathrm{h}} \right). \end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

---

[6] The local SUSY transformation is obtained by requiring that it preserves the gauge fixing conditions (9).

Here, we have supposed that only $\phi^{\rm h}$ has a nontrivial field configuration among the physical scalar fields.

By solving the third equation, the Killing spinor can be written as

$$\epsilon_\alpha = \frac{ie^{i\vartheta}}{\sqrt{2}} e^{\frac{A}{2}} \epsilon_{0\alpha}, \tag{36}$$

where ϵ_0 is a constant 3D Majorana spinor. Note that R.H.S. of the last equation in Eq.(35) is equal to $-\langle A_y \rangle$. (See Eq.(11).) This means that ϑ_A in Eq.(29) can be interpreted as the phase of the Killing spinor ϑ when the background is BPS. Thus, from the first two equations in Eq.(35), we can define the following two functions to characterize the deviation from the SUSY limit.

$$\begin{aligned} f^G_{\rm bg} &= \frac{\dot{A}}{\kappa^2} + e^{-2i\vartheta_A} e^{\frac{\kappa^2}{2}|\phi^{\rm h}_{\rm bg}|^2} \bar{P}_{\rm hid}, \\ f^{\rm h}_{\rm bg} &= \dot{\phi}^{\rm h}_{\rm bg} - e^{2i\vartheta_A} e^{\frac{\kappa^2}{2}|\phi^{\rm h}_{\rm bg}|^2} \left\{ \frac{\partial \bar{P}_{\rm hid}}{\partial \bar{\phi}^{\rm h}}(\phi^{\rm h}_{\rm bg}) + \kappa^2 \phi^{\rm h}_{\rm bg} \bar{P}_{\rm hid}(\phi^{\rm h}_{\rm bg}) \right\}. \end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

From Eq.(31), we can see that $\langle A_y \rangle$ also characterizes the magnitude of SUSY breaking. Therefore, we will refer to these three functions as the *SUSY-breaking functions* in the following.

3.2 Gauge fixing and κ-expansion

To obtain the action, we have to fix the redundant superconformal gauge symmetry. However, the gauge fixing conditions (9) are not invariant under the global SUSY transformation $\delta(\epsilon_0)$. Thus it will be broken after the gauge fixing.

Practically, it is enough to calculate the action up to the next leading order in the κ-expansion. In order to count the power of κ in the calculation, it is convenient to decompose φ^Σ as

$$\varphi^\Sigma = \phi^\Sigma_{\rm bg} + \tilde{\varphi}^\Sigma, \tag{38}$$

where

$$\phi^\Sigma_{\rm bg} \equiv \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} \kappa^{-1} e^{\frac{\kappa^2}{6}|\phi^{\rm h}_{\rm bg}|^2} \tag{39}$$

is the background value of ϕ^Σ. Then, only $\phi^\Sigma_{\rm bg}$ reduces the power of κ.

$$\begin{aligned} \phi^\Sigma_{\rm bg} &= \mathcal{O}(\kappa^{-1}), \\ \varphi^{I\neq 0} &= \mathcal{O}(\kappa^0), \\ \dot{\phi}^\Sigma_{\rm bg}, \tilde{\varphi}^\Sigma &= \mathcal{O}(\kappa). \end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

The action is calculated from Eq.(31) with

$$\begin{aligned} G &= -\bar{\varphi}^{\bar{\Sigma}} \varphi^\Sigma \exp\left\{ -\frac{\kappa^2}{3} \sum_{I\neq 0} \bar{\varphi}^{\bar{I}} \varphi^I \right\}, \\ W &= \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^{3/2} \kappa^3 \left(\varphi^\Sigma\right)^3 \left\{ P_{\rm hid}(\varphi^{\rm h}) + P_{\rm vis}(\varphi^i) \right\}, \end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

and rewriting the components of $\tilde{\varphi}^\Sigma$ in terms of the physical fields by using the gauge fixing conditions (9).

Since we are interested only in the visible sector, we will replace $\varphi^{\rm h}$ with its background value

$$\varphi^{\rm h}_{\rm bg} = \phi^{\rm h}_{\rm bg} + \frac{e^A}{2}\theta^2 f^{\rm h}_{\rm bg}, \tag{42}$$

where $f^{\rm h}_{\rm bg}$ is defined in Eq.(37), and ignore the fluctuation modes around it.

Then, the resulting action in the visible sector is obtained as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\rm vis} = & \int\! d^4x \int\! d^2\theta \left[e^A \sum_i D^\alpha \bar{\varphi}^{\bar{i}} D_\alpha \varphi^i + 4e^{2A}{\rm Im}\left\{ \frac{1}{2}\sum_i \bar{\varphi}^{\bar{i}} \nabla_y \varphi^i + e^{\frac{\kappa^2}{2}\left|\phi^{\rm h}_{\rm bg}\right|^2} P_{\rm vis}(\varphi^i) \right\} \right. \\ & \qquad\qquad \left. + \frac{4}{3} e^{2A} \langle A_y \rangle \sum_i \bar{\varphi}^{\bar{i}} \varphi^i \right] \\ & + \kappa^2 \int\! d^4x\; e^{3A} \left[{\rm Im}\left\{ -2\sum_i f^G_{\rm bg} \phi^i \bar{f}^{\bar{i}} + 6\hat{f}^\Sigma_{\rm bg} P_{\rm vis} - \frac{4\langle A_y\rangle}{3\kappa^2}\left(3P_{\rm vis} - \sum_i \phi^i \frac{\partial P_{\rm vis}}{\partial \phi^i} \right) \right\} \right. \\ & \qquad\qquad \left. - \frac{\langle A_y \rangle}{2\kappa^2} {\rm tr}\left\{ (\lambda^g_1)^2 + (\lambda^g_2)^2 \right\} + \cdots \right] + \mathcal{O}(\kappa^4), \end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

where the ellipsis in the last line denotes quartic or higher terms. The function $\hat{f}^\Sigma_{\rm bg}(y)$ is defined as

$$\hat{f}^\Sigma_{\rm bg} \equiv \frac{i}{3}\left\{ \bar{\phi}^{\rm h}_{\rm bg} f^{\rm h}_{\rm bg} + 3f^G_{\rm bg} \right\} \tag{44}$$

and corresponds to the f-term of the background value of φ^Σ,

$$\varphi^\Sigma_{\rm bg} = \phi^\Sigma_{\rm bg}\left(1 + \kappa^2 \frac{e^A}{2}\theta^2 \hat{f}^\Sigma_{\rm bg} \right). \tag{45}$$

Note that $\langle A_y \rangle = \mathcal{O}(\kappa^2)$. The action at the lowest order $\mathcal{O}(\kappa^0)$ is manifestly supersymmetric because it is written only by the superfields. This is a trivial result since SUSY breaking effects are mediated only through the space-time geometry, *i.e.*, the gravitational effect.

Note that the gauge fixing conditions (9) is not invariant under $\delta(\epsilon_0)$ even in the case that the background configuration is BPS. This reflects the fact that the SUGRA action cannot be expressed only by the superfields. So there are also the SUGRA terms besides the SUSY breaking terms among terms that cannot be written by the superfields in Eq.(43). Such SUGRA terms appear in the quartic or higher terms. Therefore, the quadratic and cubic terms in the third and fourth lines of Eq.(43) are purely SUSY breaking terms. These terms will be important as the soft SUSY-breaking terms when we extend our discussion to the 4D effective theory of 5D SUGRA.

Note also that all SUSY breaking terms should be associated with at least one of the SUSY-breaking functions $f^{\rm h}_{\rm bg}$, $f^G_{\rm bg}$, $\langle A_y \rangle$. Therefore, we may pick up only terms involving such functions in order to obtain the SUSY-breaking terms. Other terms are ensured to be cancelled with each other. This simplifies somewhat tedious calculations in the gauge fixing procedure.

3.3 Example of non-BPS configuration

For a specific example of the non-BPS backgrounds, we will take a configuration discussed in Ref. [9].

3.3.1 Properties of the background

In Ref. [9], a topological winding number is introduced to stabilize the non-BPS configuration along the S^1-compactified extra dimension. However, a periodic solution with no winding is also possible in the case that the extra dimension is compactified on S^1/Z_2. The configuration corresponds to the coexistence of a BPS domain wall at $y = 0$ and an anti-BPS wall at $y = \pi r$. We will refer to the 3D hyperplanes at $y = 0, \pi r$ as the "boundaries" despite the S^1-compactification as the authors of Ref. [9] do.

The radius of the extra dimension r is stabilized by the scalar configuration, and its size is determined by the tensions on the 3D boundaries[7]. For example, for a unit winding solution,

$$\pi r \sim \frac{1}{\Lambda} \ln \frac{\Lambda^4}{\kappa^2 \tau_0^2}, \tag{46}$$

where Λ is a characteristic mass scale of the potential for $\phi^{\rm h}$, and τ_0 is the boundary tension at $y = 0$[8]. Here, we have used the weak-gravity approximation [9]. In this approximation, the warp factor $A(y)$ is calculated as

$$A(y) = A_0 - \frac{\kappa^2 \tau_0}{4} y + \cdots , \tag{47}$$

where A_0 is a normalization constant and the ellipsis denotes the higher-order corrections in κ.

In the limit of $r \to \infty$ (or $\tau_0 \to 0$), the configuration around $y = 0$ approaches to a BPS solution with $\vartheta = 0$ and 3D $\mathcal{N} = 1$ SUSY is recovered.

In this model, the scalar configuration $\phi^{\rm h}_{\rm bg}$ is real and thus $\langle A_y \rangle = 0$. So the gaugino mass is not induced on this background.

3.3.2 Mode expansion

Since we are interested in the low-energy effective theory, we will focus on the zero-modes of the bulk fields. We will introduce the kink mass terms.

$$P_{\rm vis}(\varphi^i) = \sum_i m_i \varepsilon(y) (\varphi^i)^2 + (\text{interaction terms}), \tag{48}$$

---

[7] The model in Ref. [9] does not introduce any boundary fields, but admits positive and negative tensions on the boundaries.

[8] The tension on the other boundary $\tau_{\pi r}$ must be negative and its magnitude is determined by τ_0. The fine tuning between τ_0 and $\tau_{\pi r}$ corresponds to the assumption of the vanishing cosmological constant in the 3D effective theory.

where $m_i > 0$ are the mass parameters and the function $\varepsilon(y)$ is defined as

$$\varepsilon(y) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } 0 < y < \pi r, \\ 0 & \text{for } y = 0, \pm\pi r, \\ -1 & \text{for } -\pi r < y < 0. \end{cases} \tag{49}$$

Here,we have assumed that φ^i is gauge-singlet for simplicity. The extension to the charged matter case is straightforward.

Then, the fermionic component of φ^i is expanded as

$$\chi^i(x^m, y) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left\{ u^i_{\mathrm{R}0}(y)\chi^i_{\mathrm{R}0}(x^m) + i u^i_{\mathrm{I}0}(y)\chi^i_{\mathrm{I}0}(x^m) \right\} + (\text{massive modes}). \tag{50}$$

The mode-functions are obtained by solving the linearized equations of motion. For example, those of the zero-modes are

$$\begin{aligned} u^i_{\mathrm{R}0}(y) &= C^i_{\mathrm{R}} e^{-\frac{3}{2}A(y)} e^{-m_i|y|}, \\ u^i_{\mathrm{I}0}(y) &= C^i_{\mathrm{I}} e^{-\frac{3}{2}A(y)} e^{m_i|y|}, \end{aligned} \tag{51}$$

where C_{R} and C_{I} are the normalization constants determined by

$$\int dy\; e^{2A} \left(u^i_{\mathrm{R}0}\right)^2 = \int dy\; e^{2A} \left(u^i_{\mathrm{I}0}\right)^2 = 1. \tag{52}$$

Depending on the value of m_i, the zero-mode $\chi^i_{\mathrm{R}0}$ can be localized around $y = 0$.

As mentioned above, 3D $\mathcal{N} = 1$ SUSY characterized by $\vartheta = 0$ is a good symmetry around $y = 0$ when the radius r is large. Thus, if $u^i_{\mathrm{R}0}$ is localized around $y = 0$, $\chi^i_{\mathrm{R}0}$ forms a supermultiplet for that SUSY. Namely, it is useful to define a 3D superfield:

$$\varphi^i_0(x^m, \theta) = a^i_0(x^m) + \theta\chi^i_{\mathrm{R}0}(x^m) + \frac{1}{2}\theta^2 f^i_0(x^m). \tag{53}$$

On the other hand, $u^i_{\mathrm{I}0}$ is localized around $y = \pi r$, and an opposite half of the bulk SUSY characterized by $\vartheta = -\pi$ is a good symmetry there. So $\chi^i_{\mathrm{I}0}$ forms a supermultiplet for this SUSY.

$$\varphi'^i_0(x^m, \theta') = a'^i_0(x^m) + \theta'\chi^i_{\mathrm{I}0}(x^m) + \frac{1}{2}\theta'^2 f'^i_0(x^m). \tag{54}$$

Using the method used in Ref. [15], we can see that the zero-modes are embedded into the bulk field φ^i as

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi^i(x^m, y, \theta) = \frac{e^{\frac{A}{2}}}{\sqrt{2}} &\left\{ u^i_{\mathrm{R}0}(y)\varphi^i_0(x^m, \theta) + u^i_{\mathrm{I}0}(y + i e^A \theta_2^2)\varphi'^i_0(x^m, i\theta) \right\} \\ &+ (\text{massive modes}). \end{aligned} \tag{55}$$

From this expression,

$$\mathrm{Im}\left(\phi^i \bar{f}^i\right) = -\frac{e^{\frac{A}{2}}}{2}\left(u^i_{\mathrm{R}0}\partial_y u^i_{\mathrm{I}0}\right)\phi^i_0\phi'^i_0 - \frac{e^{\frac{A}{2}}}{2} u^i_{\mathrm{I}0}\partial_y u^i_{\mathrm{I}0}(\phi'^i_0)^2 + \cdots, \tag{56}$$

where the ellipsis denotes terms involving massive Kaluza-Klein modes. Thus, the first term in the third line of Eq.(43) gives mixing terms between the scalar modes localized on the different boundaries[9].

Since we do not suppose any mechanism for localization of the gauge field, the mode expansion of the gauge supermultiplet is trivial.

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho^\alpha(x^m,y,\theta) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi r}}\rho_0^\alpha(x^m,\theta) \\
&\quad +\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi r}}\left\{\cos\frac{ny}{r}\cdot\rho_{(n+)}^\alpha(x^m,\theta)+\sin\frac{ny}{r}\cdot\rho_{(n-)}^\alpha(x^m,\theta)\right\}, \\
\sigma(x^m,y,\theta) &= \frac{e^{-\frac{A}{2}}}{\sqrt{2\pi r}}\sigma_0(x^m,\theta) \\
&\quad +\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{e^{-\frac{A}{2}}}{\sqrt{\pi r}}\left\{\cos\frac{ny}{r}\cdot\sigma_{(n+)}(x^m,\theta)+\sin\frac{ny}{r}\cdot\sigma_{(n-)}(x^m,\theta)\right\}. \qquad (57)
\end{aligned}$$

The signs in the label of the 3D superfields denote the parity under $y \to -y$. The normalization factors should be modified in the case of the orbifold compactification.

Plugging these expressions into Eq.(43) and performing the y-integration, we can obtain the desired action for the visible sector.

3.3.3 SUSY-breaking scales in the effective theory

In this example, scales introduced in the bulk theory are the Planck scale $M_{\rm pl}$, the kink mass parameters m_i, the characteristic scale of the hidden sector dynamics Λ and the compactification scale r^{-1} (or the tension scale $\tau_0^{1/3}$). From Eq.(43), the SUSY-breaking scalar masses in the 3D effective theory have a form of

$$m_S^2 = \kappa^2\Lambda^3 m_i \alpha(m_i,\Lambda,r), \qquad (58)$$

where $\alpha(m_i,\Lambda,r)$ is a dimensionless function expressed by the overlap integral of the mode-functions and the SUSY-breaking functions $f_{\rm bg}^{\rm h}$, $f_{\rm bg}^G$. For large r, its asymptotic form is

$$\alpha(m_i,\Lambda,r) \sim e^{-c(m_i)\Lambda r}, \qquad (59)$$

where $c(m_i)$ is a positive number depending on the strength of the localization of the mode-functions.

The gaugino mass m_g does not appear at tree-level. However, if the background configuration has a non-zero $\langle A_y\rangle$, it will appear through the spurion superfield T in Eq.(31). For instance, if $\arg(\phi_{\rm bg}^{\rm h})$ varies with $\mathcal{O}(1)$ amplitude as y goes from 0 to πr, it is roughly estimated as

$$m_g = \int dy\,\frac{e^{3A}\langle A_y\rangle}{2\pi r} \sim \kappa^2\Lambda^3. \qquad (60)$$

---

[9] Note that $f_{\rm bg}^G$ is real in this model.

Here, we have used the kink mass terms to localize the zero-modes of the matter fields. We can also localize them by introducing the coupling between the matters and $\phi^{\rm h}$, just like the fat brane scenario [16]. In this case, however, the SUSY-breaking masses arise through the direct coupling to $\phi^{\rm h}$ as discussed in Ref. [15], and they become the dominant SUSY-breaking effects in the visible sector. So we do not consider such a possibility in this paper.

3.4 Orbifold compactification

Before ending this section, we will briefly comment on the case that the extra dimension is compactified on the orbifold S^1/Z_2. The Z_2-transformation is $y \to -y$, and the fixed-point boundaries are at $y = 0$ and $y = \pi r$. Under the Z_2 transformation, each field is transformed as follows.

Scalar field ϕ :

$$\phi(x^m, y) \to \Pi_\phi \bar{\phi}(x^m, -y). \tag{61}$$

Spinor field χ^α :

$$\chi^\alpha(x^m, y) \to \Pi_\chi \bar{\chi}^{\dot{\alpha}}(x^m, -y). \tag{62}$$

Note that there is no distinction between the dotted and undotted indices in three dimensions. So the orbifold identification is consistent on the 3D boundaries.

Vector field B^g_μ :

$$\begin{aligned} B^g_m(x^m, y) &\to \Pi_B B^g_m(x^m, -y), \\ B^g_y(x^m, y) &\to -\Pi_B B^g_y(x^m, -y). \end{aligned} \tag{63}$$

Π_ϕ, Π_χ and Π_B are the eigenvalues of the Z_2-parity for the corresponding fields. Π_B must be chosen to $+1$ in order for the effective theory to have the 3D gauge field. Note that B^g_y can be eliminated completely in this case. As mentioned in Ref. [13], we can eliminate B^g_y except its zero-mode by using the 4D gauge transformation, and the zero-mode is projected out by the orbifold identification.

From the above transformation properties, the orbifold identification explicitly breaks the bulk 4D $\mathcal{N} = 1$ SUSY to 3D $\mathcal{N} = 1$ SUSY.

If we assume the Z_2-parity eigenvalues for each field as

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi = +1 &: \phi^{I\neq 1}, \quad \chi^{I\neq 1}, \quad B^g_\mu \\ \Pi = -1 &: \phi^{I=1}, \quad \chi^{I=1}, \quad \lambda^g, \end{aligned} \tag{64}$$

the non-BPS solution of Ref. [9] is allowed. In this case, a a half of the bulk SUSY is explicitly broken by the orbifold projection, and the rest of it is broken by the non-BPS background.

4 Summary and discussions

We have discussed the effects of SUSY breaking mediated by the deformation of the space-time geometry due to the backreaction of a bulk scalar field. Since the superfield formalism is very useful, we derived the effective action expressed by the superfields and the SUSY breaking terms. The main obstacle in this procedure is the fact that we cannot define the supersymmetry on the non-BPS background geometry in the ordinary sense. We have solved this difficulty by defining the global SUSY *before* the gauge fixing of the superconformal symmetry. Since this SUSY transformation does not preserve the gauge fixing conditions, the effective theory has SUSY breaking terms. Namely, in our method, *SUSY is broken by the gauge fixing conditions.*

Let us summarize the procedure to obtain the effective action. We have assumed the existence of the non-BPS solution in the 4D SUGRA model.

1. Define 3D global SUSY transformation that preserves the gravitational background.
2. Construct superfields by using the above transformation.
3. Rewrite the action on the gravitational background in terms of the superfields.
4. Rewrite the components of the compensator superfield in terms of the physical fields by the gauge fixing conditions.
5. Substitute the mode-expanded expressions and perform the y-integration, then we can obtain the effective action.

At Step 4, we have dropped the fluctuation modes of the hidden sector field $\Phi^{I=1}$ around the background because we are interested only in the visible sector.

Note that all the SUSY breaking terms involve at least one of the SUSY-breaking functions $f_{\rm bg}^{\rm h}$, $f_{\rm bg}^{G}$ and $\langle A_y\rangle$. In Eq.(43), SUSY breaking scalar masses and scalar trilinear couplings come from only the superpotential of the bulk 4D theory, but this is due to the assumption that the Kähler potential is minimal. Since the compensator multiplet does not couple to the superfield strength multiplet, no gaugino mass arises from the deformed geometry if $\langle A_y\rangle = 0$.

Eq.(43) shows that there is no BPS solution with $\langle A_y\rangle \neq 0$. In other words, if we consider the case of $\langle A_y\rangle \neq 0$, the corresponding background is necessarily non-BPS, and $f_{\rm bg}^{\rm h}$ and $f_{\rm bg}^{G}$ also do not vanish.

Scales introduced in the bulk theory are the 4D Planck scale $M_{\rm pl}$, the mass parameters for the matter fields m_i, the characteristic scale of the hidden sector dynamics Λ, and the compactification scale r^{-1}. In terms of these scales, the SUSY-breaking scalar masses induced in the visible sector have a form of

$$m_S^2 = \frac{\Lambda^3 m_i}{M_{\rm pl}^2}\alpha(m_i, \Lambda, r), \tag{65}$$

where $\alpha(m_i, \Lambda, r)$ is a dimensionless function expressed by the overlap integral of the mode-functions and the SUSY-breaking functions $f_{\rm bg}^{\rm h}$, $f_{\rm bg}^{G}$ and $\langle A_y \rangle$. The gaugino mass is induced by the non-zero $\langle A_y \rangle$, and roughly estimated as

$$m_g \sim \frac{\Lambda^3}{M_{\rm pl}^2}. \tag{66}$$

Here, we have supposed that $\arg(\phi_{\rm bg}^{\rm h})$ varies with $\mathcal{O}(1)$ amplitude as y goes from 0 to πr. These estimations are modified if the hidden sector involves more than one mass scales.

For example, in the case that $m_i \sim \Lambda$ and $\alpha = \mathcal{O}(1)$, the above expressions mean that the gaugino mass is much smaller than the scalar masses if $M_{\rm pl} \gg \Lambda$. However, as seen in Sect. 3.3.3, α can be exponentially small. In such a case, the gaugino mass can dominate the scalar masses.

If the warp factor is not so large, the gaugino mass is also estimated from Eq.(60) as

$$m_g \sim \frac{|\Delta\vartheta_A|}{r}, \qquad \Delta\vartheta_A \equiv \begin{cases} \vartheta_A(\pi r) - \vartheta_A(-\pi r) & \text{for } S^1\text{-compactification} \\ \vartheta_A(\pi r) - \vartheta_A(0) & \text{for } S^1/Z_2\text{-compactification} \end{cases} \tag{67}$$

where $\vartheta_A(y)$ is defined in Eq.(29). Comparing this and Eq.(66), we can see that $r^{-1} \sim \Lambda^3/M_{\rm pl}^2 \ll \Lambda$ when $\Delta\vartheta_A = \mathcal{O}(1)$ and $M_{\rm pl} \gg \Lambda$. In fact, since Λ^{-1} is the characteristic length of the nontrivial field configuration, the radius r is generally larger than Λ^{-1}.

Since the SUSY breaking effects are suppressed by the Planck scale, our scenario can be considered as a kind of the gravity mediation. However, there are some points that should be noticed. First, from the viewpoint of the effective theory, SUSY breaking cannot be regarded as the spontaneous breaking because the order parameter of SUSY breaking Λ_S is roughly of $\mathcal{O}(\Lambda)$ and is generally higher than the compactification scale r^{-1}, which is the cut-off scale of the 3D effective theory. Second, the induced SUSY breaking scale in the effective theory can be suppressed by the overlap integral of the mode functions and the SUSY-breaking functions. (See α in Eq.(59).) Third, the gaugino mass can be induced by non-zero $\langle A_y \rangle$ without introducing a non-minimal gauge kinetic function. This is very similar to the Scherk-Schwarz (SS) SUSY breaking in the flat space-time. However, this breaking is irrelevant to the $U(1)_R$ twisting since $U(1)_R$ is a symmetry *after* the gauge fixing and independent of $U(1)_A$, which is completely fixed by the gauge fixing condition. In addition, $\langle A_y \rangle$ is not an input parameter as in the SS breaking, but is determined by the hidden sector dynamics and has a nontrivial y-dependence. Further, the non-zero $\langle A_y \rangle$ indicates that the background configuration is non-BPS as mentioned above. Thus, it inevitably leads to SUSY breaking terms that associate with $f_{\rm bg}^{\rm h}$ and $f_{\rm bg}^{G}$, to which the SS breaking does not have any resemblances.

To investigate more phenomenological aspects, we should extend our discussion to 5D SUGRA. Note that the procedure explained in this paper requires only the knowledge of the superconformal formulation of 4D SUGRA and the 3D superfield formalism. The 4D superfield formalism is not necessary. Therefore, when we extend our method to 5D SUGRA, we do not need to deal with the unknown 5D superfield formalism. The 5D superconformal formulation and the well-known 4D $\mathcal{N} = 1$ superfield formalism are enough. The former has already been studied in Ref. [12, 17], and the 5D invariant action is provided in Ref. [18]. So we can utilize their results. Our strategy in this paper can basically be extended to 5D SUGRA straightforwardly, but there are some subtle points. For example, all hypermultiplets are charged under the central charge group $U(1)_Z$ [17], which has no corresponding group in the 4D case. The $U(1)_Z$ transformation of the hypermultiplets is highly nontrivial, and thus some special treatment for the $U(1)_Z$ gauge multiplet is necessary in the superfield formalism. However, we expect that these subtle points do not cause serious difficulties, and can be solved by slight modifications of our method. Research along this direction is now in progress. Including the brane-localized terms in the discussion is also an interesting issue. We will discuss these subjects in the subsequent paper.

Acknowledgments

The author would like to thank Hiroyuki Abe and Keisuke Ohashi for useful discussion and advise. The author is indebted to Tatsuya Noguchi for a collaboration in an early stage. This work was supported from the Astrophysical Research Center for the Structure and Evolution of the Cosmos (ARCSEC) funded by the Korea Science and Engineering Foundation and the Korean Ministry of Science.

A Notations

A.1 Superconformal formulation of 4D SUGRA

Basically, we follow the notations of Ref. [11] for the four-dimensional bulk theory.

Our notations can be obtained from those of Ref. [12] by rewriting spinors into the 2-component representation and replacing each quantity as follows.

Metric:

$$\eta_{ab} \to -\eta_{ab}. \tag{68}$$

Superconformal gauge fields:

$$\begin{aligned} e_\mu^{\ a} &\to e_\mu^{\ a}, \quad \psi_\mu^\alpha \to \frac{\kappa}{2}\psi_\mu^\alpha, \quad b_\mu \to b_\mu, \quad A_\mu \to -\frac{4}{3}A_\mu, \\ \omega_\mu^{\ ab} &\to -\omega_\mu^{\ ab}, \quad \phi_\mu^\alpha \to i\varphi_\mu^\alpha, \quad f_\mu^{\ a} \to -f_\mu^{\ a}. \end{aligned} \tag{69}$$

Real general multiplet:

$$\begin{aligned} C &\to C, \quad \zeta \to -\zeta, \quad \frac{1}{2}(H+iK) \to i\mathcal{H}, \\ B_a &\to -B_a, \quad \lambda_\alpha \to \lambda_\alpha, \quad D \to D. \end{aligned} \tag{70}$$

Chiral multiplet:

$$\mathcal{A} \to \phi, \quad \chi_\alpha \to -\sqrt{2}\chi_\alpha, \quad \mathcal{F} \to -\mathcal{F}. \tag{71}$$

In the following, we will collect some important expressions in our notations.

4D superconformal algebra:

$$\begin{aligned}
[M_{ab}, M_{cd}] &= i\left(\eta_{ad}M_{bc} + \eta_{bc}M_{ad} - \eta_{ac}M_{bd} - \eta_{bd}M_{ac}\right), \\
[M_{ab}, P_c] &= i\left(\eta_{bc}P_a - \eta_{ac}P_b\right), \quad [M_{ab}, K_c] = i\left(\eta_{bc}K_a - \eta_{ac}K_b\right), \\
[D, P_a] &= -iP_a, \quad [D, K_a] = iK_a, \quad [P_a, K_b] = 2iM_{ab} - 2i\eta_{ab}D, \\
[A, Q_\alpha] &= Q_\alpha, \quad [A, S_\alpha] = -S_\alpha, \\
[P_a, S_\alpha] &= -i\left(\sigma_a\right)_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}\bar{Q}^{\dot{\alpha}}, \quad [K_a, Q_\alpha] = -i\left(\sigma_a\right)_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}\bar{S}^{\dot{\alpha}}, \\
[M_{ab}, Q_\alpha] &= i\left(\sigma_{ab}\right)_\alpha^{\ \beta} Q_\beta, \quad [M_{ab}, S_\alpha] = i\left(\sigma_{ab}\right)_\alpha^{\ \beta} S_\beta, \\
[D, Q_\alpha] &= -\frac{i}{2}Q_\alpha, \quad [D, S_\alpha] = \frac{i}{2}S_\alpha, \\
\left\{Q_\alpha, \bar{Q}_{\dot{\alpha}}\right\} &= 2\left(\sigma^a\right)_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}} P_a, \quad \left\{S_\alpha, \bar{S}_{\dot{\alpha}}\right\} = 2\left(\sigma^a\right)_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}} K_a, \\
\left\{Q_\alpha, S_\beta\right\} &= -2\epsilon_{\beta\gamma}\left(\sigma^{ab}\right)_\alpha^{\ \gamma} M_{ab} + 2\epsilon_{\alpha\beta}D + 3i\epsilon_{\alpha\beta}A,
\end{aligned} \tag{72}$$

All the other commutators vanish.

Transformation law of the gravitational multiplet:

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta e_\mu^{\ a} &= i\kappa\left(\epsilon\sigma^a\bar{\psi}_\mu + \bar{\epsilon}\bar{\sigma}^a\psi_\mu\right) - \lambda_D e_\mu^{\ a}, \\
\delta\psi_\mu^\alpha &= 2\kappa^{-1}\mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{h}}_\mu\epsilon^\alpha - \frac{1}{2}\lambda_D\psi_\mu^\alpha - i\vartheta_A\psi_\mu^\alpha + \left(\bar{\eta}\bar{\sigma}_\mu\right)^\alpha, \\
\delta A_\mu &= \partial_\mu\vartheta_A - 3\left(\epsilon\varphi_\mu + \bar{\epsilon}\bar{\varphi}_\mu\right) + \frac{3\kappa}{2}\left(\eta\psi_\mu + \bar{\eta}\bar{\psi}_\mu\right),
\end{aligned} \tag{73}$$

where $\mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{h}}$ is a covariant derivative with respective to the homogeneous transformations M_{ab}, D, A.

$$\mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{h}}_\mu\epsilon^\alpha = \partial_\mu\epsilon^\alpha - \frac{1}{2}\omega_\mu^{\ ab}\left(\epsilon\sigma_{ab}\right)^\alpha + \frac{1}{2}b_\mu\epsilon^\alpha + iA_\mu\epsilon^\alpha. \tag{74}$$

Transformation laws of the other multiplets can be read off from Ref. [12] by the replacements (68)-(71).

Multiplication laws of chiral multiplets:

From a set of chiral multiplets $\Sigma^I = [\phi^I, \chi^I_\alpha, \mathcal{F}^I]$, we can produce a new chiral multiplet $W(\Sigma)$ where W is an arbitrary function.

$$W(\Sigma) = [W(\phi), W_I\chi^I_\alpha, -\frac{1}{2}W_{IJ}\chi^I\chi^J + W_I\mathcal{F}^I]. \tag{75}$$

If a function G involves both chiral and anti-chiral multiplets, it induces a general multiplet $G(\Sigma, \bar{\Sigma}) = [C^G, \zeta^G_\alpha, \mathcal{H}^G, B^G_a, \lambda^G_\alpha, D^G]$ with

$$\begin{aligned}
C^G &= G(\phi, \bar{\phi}), \\
\zeta^G_\alpha &= -\sqrt{2} i G_I \chi^I_\alpha, \\
\mathcal{H}^G &= \frac{i}{2} G_{IJ} \left(\chi^I \chi^J\right) - i G_I \mathcal{F}^I, \\
B^G_a &= -i G_I \mathcal{D}_a \phi^I + i G_{\bar{J}} \mathcal{D}_a \bar{\phi}^{\bar{J}} + G_{I\bar{J}} \left(\chi^I \sigma_a \bar{\chi}^{\bar{J}}\right), \\
\lambda^G_\alpha &= \sqrt{2} G_{I\bar{J}} \left\{ \left(\sigma^a \bar{\chi}^{\bar{J}}\right)_\alpha \mathcal{D}_a \phi^I + i \bar{\mathcal{F}}^{\bar{J}} \chi^I_\alpha \right\} - \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}} G_{I\bar{J}\bar{K}} \left(\bar{\chi}^{\bar{J}} \bar{\chi}^{\bar{K}}\right) \chi^I_\alpha, \\
D^G &= G_{I\bar{J}} \left\{ -2 \mathcal{D}^a \bar{\phi}^{\bar{J}} \mathcal{D}_a \phi^I - i \chi^I \sigma^a \mathcal{D}_a \bar{\chi}^{\bar{J}} - i \bar{\chi}^{\bar{J}} \bar{\sigma}^a \mathcal{D}_a \chi^I + 2 \bar{\mathcal{F}}^{\bar{J}} \mathcal{F}^I \right\} \\
&\quad + G_{IJ\bar{K}} \left\{ i \chi^J \sigma^a \bar{\chi}^{\bar{K}} \mathcal{D}_a \phi^I - \bar{\mathcal{F}}^{\bar{K}} \left(\chi^I \chi^J\right) \right\} \\
&\quad + G_{I\bar{J}\bar{K}} \left\{ i \bar{\chi}^{\bar{K}} \bar{\sigma}^a \chi^I \mathcal{D}_a \bar{\phi}^{\bar{J}} - \mathcal{F}^I \left(\bar{\chi}^{\bar{J}} \bar{\chi}^{\bar{K}}\right) \right\} + \frac{1}{2} G_{IJ\bar{K}\bar{L}} \left(\chi^I \chi^J\right) \left(\bar{\chi}^{\bar{K}} \bar{\chi}^{\bar{L}}\right),
\end{aligned} \tag{76}$$

where $\mathcal{D}_\mu$ is the superconformal covariant derivative.

F-term action formula:

For a chiral multiplet $\Phi^{(w=3)} = [\phi, \chi, \mathcal{F}]$ with weight $w = 3$ ($n = 2$), we can construct the following superconformal invariant action:

$$S_F = \int d^4x \left[\Phi^{(w=3)}\right]_F \equiv \int d^4x e \left[\mathcal{F} + \sqrt{2} i \bar{\psi}_a \bar{\sigma}^a \chi - 4 \bar{\psi}_a \bar{\sigma}^{ab} \bar{\psi}_b \phi + \text{h.c.} \right]. \tag{77}$$

D-term action formula:

For a real general multiplet $V = [C, \zeta_\alpha, \mathcal{H}, B_a, \lambda_\alpha, D]$ with weight $w = 2$, $n = 0$, we can construct the following invariant action:

$$\begin{aligned}
S_D &= \int d^4x \left[V^{(w=2,n=0)}\right]_D \\
&\equiv \int d^4x e \Big[D - \psi_a \sigma^a \bar{\lambda} + \bar{\psi}_a \bar{\sigma}^a \lambda - 2i \epsilon^{abcd} \psi_a \sigma_b \bar{\psi}_c \left(B_d + \psi_d \zeta + \bar{\psi}_d \bar{\zeta} \right) \\
&\qquad + \frac{1}{3} \left\{ R(\omega) + 4 e^{-1} \epsilon^{abcd} \left(\psi_a \sigma_d \mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{h}}_b \bar{\psi}_c - \bar{\psi}_a \bar{\sigma}_d \mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{h}}_b \psi_c \right) \right\} C \\
&\qquad + \frac{4i}{3} \left(\zeta \sigma^{ab} \mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{h}}_a \psi_b - \bar{\zeta} \bar{\sigma}^{ab} \mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{h}}_a \bar{\psi}_b \right) \Big],
\end{aligned} \tag{78}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
R(\omega) &\equiv e_a{}^\mu e_b{}^\nu R_{\mu\nu}{}^{ab}(\omega) = 2 e_a{}^\mu e_b{}^\nu \partial_\mu \omega_\nu{}^{ab} + \omega_b{}^{ac} \omega_{ac}{}^b - \omega_a{}^{ac} \omega_{bc}{}^b, \\
\mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{h}}_\mu \psi^\alpha_\nu &\equiv \partial_\mu \psi^\alpha_\nu - \frac{1}{2} \omega_\mu{}^{ab} \left(\psi_\nu \sigma_{ab}\right)^\alpha + \frac{1}{2} b_\mu \psi^\alpha_\nu + i A_\mu \psi^\alpha_\nu.
\end{aligned} \tag{79}$$

Gauge fixing conditions:

The first condition in Eq.(9) comes from the requirement that the Einstein term should be canonically normalized. Namely, C in Eq.(78) should be fixed as

$$C = -\bar{\phi}^{\bar{\Sigma}}\phi^{\Sigma}\exp\left\{-\frac{\kappa^2}{3}\sum_{I\neq 0}\bar{\phi}^{\bar{I}}\phi^{I}\right\} = -\frac{3}{2\kappa^2}. \tag{80}$$

This condition does not determine the phase of ϕ^{Σ}. Here, we have chosen it so that ϕ^{Σ} is real.

The second condition comes from the requirement that a mixing kinetic term between the gravitino ψ_μ and the chiral fermions χ^I should vanish. Namely, the condition is

$$\zeta_\alpha = -\sqrt{2}i\bar{\phi}^{\bar{\Sigma}}\exp\left\{-\frac{\kappa^2}{3}\sum_{I\neq 0}\bar{\phi}^{\bar{I}}\phi^{I}\right\}\cdot\left(\frac{\kappa^2}{3}\phi^{\Sigma}\sum_{J\neq 0}\bar{\phi}^{\bar{I}}\chi^{I}_{\alpha} - \chi^{\Sigma}_{\alpha}\right) = 0. \tag{81}$$

Under the above two conditions, the dependence of the action S on b_μ (the gauge field for the dilatation D) becomes a surface term and vanishes.

$$S|_{b_\mu} = -2\int d^4x\,\partial_\mu(eb^\mu) = 0. \tag{82}$$

Therefore, we can fix b_μ to an arbitrary value. Here, we have fixed it to zero.

A.2 Notations for 3D theory

The notations for the 3D theories are as follows.

We take the space-time metric as

$$\eta_{\underline{mn}} = \mathrm{diag}(-1,+1,+1), \tag{83}$$

where $\underline{m},\underline{n} = 0,1,3$.

The 3D γ-matrices, $(\gamma^{\underline{m}}_{(3)})_\alpha{}^\beta$, can be written by the Pauli matrices as

$$\gamma^{\underline{0}}_{(3)} = \sigma^2, \quad \gamma^{\underline{1}}_{(3)} = -i\sigma^3, \quad \gamma^{\underline{3}}_{(3)} = i\sigma^1, \tag{84}$$

and these satisfy the 3D Clifford algebra,

$$\{\gamma^{\underline{m}}_{(3)}, \gamma^{\underline{n}}_{(3)}\} = -2\eta^{\underline{mn}}. \tag{85}$$

The generators of the Lorentz group $Spin(1,2)$ are

$$\gamma^{\underline{mn}}_{(3)} \equiv \frac{1}{4}[\gamma^{\underline{m}}_{(3)}, \gamma^{\underline{n}}_{(3)}]. \tag{86}$$

The relations between the 4D σ-matrices and the above $\gamma^{\underline{m}}_{(3)}$ are

$$(\sigma^a)_{\alpha\dot\beta} = (\gamma^{\underline{0}}_{(3)}, \gamma^{\underline{1}}_{(3)}, -1, \gamma^{\underline{3}}_{(3)})_\alpha{}^\gamma(-\sigma^2)_{\gamma\beta},$$
$$(\bar\sigma^a)^{\dot\alpha\beta} = (-\sigma^2)^{\alpha\gamma}(\gamma^{\underline{0}}_{(3)}, \gamma^{\underline{1}}_{(3)}, 1, \gamma^{\underline{3}}_{(3)})_\gamma{}^\beta, \tag{87}$$

$$(\sigma^{\underline{mn}})_\alpha{}^\beta = (\gamma^{\underline{mn}}_{(3)})_\alpha{}^\beta,$$
$$(\sigma^{\underline{m2}})_\alpha{}^\beta = \frac{1}{2}(\gamma^{\underline{m}}_{(3)})_\alpha{}^\beta. \tag{88}$$

Note that, in three dimensions, there is no discrimination between the dotted and undotted indices.

The spinor indices are raised and lowered by multiplying σ^2 from the left.

$$\psi_\alpha = (\sigma^2)_{\alpha\beta}\psi^\beta, \quad \psi^\alpha = (\sigma^2)^{\alpha\beta}\psi_\beta. \tag{89}$$

We take the following convention of the contraction of spinor indices.

$$\psi_1\psi_2 \equiv \psi_1^\alpha\psi_{2\,\alpha} = (\sigma^2)_{\alpha\beta}\psi_1^\alpha\psi_2^\beta = \psi_2\psi_1. \tag{90}$$

B Radion superfield

To identify the radion superfield, we will revive the extra components of the Weyl multiplet $e_y{}^{\underline{2}}$, ψ_y^α and A_y as fields, while other components are kept to be their background values. Then, we will consider the transformation laws of them under the global SUSY transformation $\delta(\epsilon_0)$ defined by Eqs.(16) and (17). If we decompose ψ_y^α as

$$\psi_y^\alpha = \frac{e^{i\vartheta_0}}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\psi_{\mathrm{R}y}^\alpha + i\psi_{\mathrm{I}y}^\alpha\right), \tag{91}$$

we can easily show that

$$\delta(\epsilon_0)\psi_{\mathrm{I}y}^\alpha = 0. \tag{92}$$

So we can put the gauge fixing condition,

$$\psi_{\mathrm{I}y}^\alpha = 0. \tag{93}$$

Under this gauge fixing, $\delta(\epsilon_0)$ is closed among the extra components of the Weyl multiplet, and we can construct a following superfield.

$$T \equiv e^{\delta(\theta)}e_y{}^{\underline{2}} = e_y{}^{\underline{2}} - \kappa e^{\frac{A}{2}}\theta\psi_{\mathrm{R}2} + \frac{e^A}{2}\theta^2(2A_y). \tag{94}$$

This corresponds to the radion superfield. However, when a bulk scalar field is responsible for the radius stabilization, its fluctuation is entangled with the fluctuation of $e_y{}^{\underline{2}}$. Thus, we have to diagonalize the coupled system to obtain the physical radion [19].

References

[1] E. Witten, *Nucl. Phys.* **B202** (1982) 253; I. Affleck, M. Dine and N. Seiberg, *Nucl. Phys.* **B241** (1984) 493; *Nucl. Phys.* **B256** (1985) 557.

[2] N. Arkani-Hamed, S. Dimopoulos and G. Dvali, *Phys. Lett.* **B429** (1998) 263 [`hep-ph/9803315`]; I. Antoniadis, N. Arkani-Hamed, S. Dimopoulos and G. Dvali, *Phys. Lett.* **B436** (1998) 257 [`hep-ph/9804398`].

[3] L. Randall and R. Sundrum, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83** (1999) 3370 [`hep-ph/9905221`]; *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83** (1999) 4690 [`hep-th/9906064`].

[4] Y. Kawamura, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **103** (2000) 613 [`hep-ph/9902423`]; L.J. Hall, H. Murayama and Y. Nomura, *Nucl. Phys.* **B645** (2002) 85 [`hep-th/0107245`];L.J. Hall and Y. Nomura, *Phys. Rev.* **D65** (2002) 125012 [`hep-ph/0111068`].

[5] J. Scherk and J.H. Schwarz, *Phys. Lett.* **B82** (1979) 60.

[6] G. Dvali and M. Shifman, *Nucl. Phys.* **B504** (1997) 127 [`hep-th/9611213`]; M. Sakamoto, M. Tachibana and K. Takenaga, *Phys. Lett.* **B458** (1999) 231 [`hep-th/9902070`];*Prog. Theor. Phys.* **104** (2000) 633 [`hep-th/9912229`]; M. Chaichian, A. Kobakhidze and M. Tsulaia, *Phys. Lett.* **B505** (2001) 222 [`hep-th/0101210`]; J. Bagger, F. Feruglio and Fabio Zwirner, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88** (2002) 101601 [`hep-th/0107128`]; N. Maru, N. Sakai, Y. Sakamura and R. Sugisaka, *Phys. Lett.* **B496** (2000) 98 [`hep-th/0009023`]; *Nucl. Phys.* **B616** (2001) 47 [`hep-th/0107204`].

[7] W.D. Goldberger and M.B. Wise, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83** (1999) 4922 [`hep-ph/9907447`].

[8] O. DeWolfe, D.Z. Freedman, S.S. Gubser and A. Karch, *Phys. Rev.* **D62** (2000) 046008 [`hep-th/9909134`]; K. Skenderis and P.K. Townsend, *Phys. Lett.* **B468** (1999) 46; A. Lewandowski, M.J. May and Raman Sundrum, *Phys. Rev.* **D67** (2003) 024036; I. Brevik, K. Ghoroku and M. Yahiro, `hep-th/0402176`.

[9] M. Eto, N. Maru and N. Sakai, *Phys. Lett.* **B553** (2003) 87 [`hep-th/0208127`];*Nucl. Phys.* **B673** (2003) 98 [`hep-th/0307206`].

[10] T. Kugo and S. Uehara, *Nucl. Phys.* **B226** (1983) 49; *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **73** (1985) 235.

[11] J. Wess and J. Bagger, *Supersymmetry and Supergravity*, 2nd edition (Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1992).

[12] T. Kugo and S. Ohashi, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **108** (2002) 203 [`hep-th/0203276`].

[13] Y. Sakamura, *Nucl. Phys.* **B656** (2003) 132 [`hep-th/0207159`].

[14] D. Martí and A. Pomarol, *Phys. Rev.* **D64** (2001) 105025 [`hep-th/0106256`].

[15] Y. Sakamura, *JHEP* **0305** (2003) 062 [`hep-th/0304195`].

[16] N. Arkani-Hamed and M. Schmaltz, *Phys. Rev.* **D61** (2000) 033005 [`hep-ph/9903417`]; D.E. Kaplan and T.M.P. Tait, *JHEP* **0006** (2000) 020 [`hep-ph/0004200`].

[17] T. Fujita and K. Ohashi, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **106** (2001) 221 [`hep-th/0104130`].

[18] T. Kugo and K. Ohashi, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **105** (2001) 323 [`hep-ph/0010288`].

[19] L. Kofman, J. Martin and M. Peloso, `hep-ph/0401189`.